

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Vice Chair Neff called a regular adjourned meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, October 20, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Commissioners Absent: Michael Christianson

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Jarb Thaipejr, Director, Public Works Department
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

No items were added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the items be taken out of order because the discussion would be brief for Item E.3 - Proposed Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan in comparison to Item E.1 - General Plan Update Project.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to begin the discussion with Item E.3.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public comment presented.

NEW ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-51 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN – Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Loma Linda finding that the proposed amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Loma Linda Redevelopment Project conforms to the City's General Plan and other matters.

Mark Heubsch, Special Counsel for the Redevelopment Agency, presented a brief staff report stating that the purpose for placing this item on the agenda was to obtain Planning Commission confirmation through a Planning Commission Resolution stating that the proposed amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the City's Redevelopment Agency conforms to the existing General Plan.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 4-0 to recommend that the Planning Commission adopt the Resolution finding that the proposed amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Loma Linda Redevelopment Project conforms to the City's General Plan and other matters. (Christianson absent)

PC-04-52 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02 05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK) – Draft Specific Plans have been prepared for the University Village and Orchard Park project sites, which are generally located between Redlands Boulevard, Mission Road, California Street, and the Edison Easement. Approximately 1,769 housing units and approximately 172,000 square feet of commercial and mixed uses are proposed for the University Village project, and approximately 1,259 housing units and 962,676 square feet of commercial and mixed uses are proposed for the Orchard Park project. Both communities would incorporate a variety of land uses

and residential types. A joint program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for both projects.

Senior Planner Lamson presented the staff report and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to introduce the project, have the applicants make their presentations, take public testimony, and discuss questions of the Planning Commission.

Senior Planner Lamson stated that the applicants, Lewis Operating Corporation for the University Village Project and Cal 88 for the Orchard Park Project, were requesting a change to the General Plan Land Use Plan from Commercial - Business and Research Park with Support Uses, Elementary School, and Community Park to Mixed Use. She continued to say that the request included changing the Zoning Maps from Single-Family Residence (R-1), General Business (C-2), and East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Special Development and Public Institutional to Planned Community (PC). She stated that the changes were requested to accommodate the adoption of two Specific Plans (one each for the University Village and Orchard Park proposals), and the future subdivision of 308 acres into 677 single family units, 1,760 multi-family units, 591 mixed use residential units, and 675,118 square feet of commercial space, 459,558 square feet of commercial/office within mixed use, and 15.7 acres of institutional, 19.7 acres of park land, and an elementary school. Ms. Lamson stated that the project area was located north of Mission Road, south of Redlands Boulevard, east of the Edison Easement, and west of California Street. She added that the two projects were of neo-traditional designs.

Ms. Lamson explained that in October 2001, the City Council determined that they wanted the area planned cohesively and required both projects to be analyzed jointly in one environmental document. She continued to say that on November 27, 2001, the Planning Commission approved the conceptual plan for University Village and in April 2002, the City of Loma Linda retained the services of RBF Consulting to prepare a joint Environmental Impact Report for the two projects. Ms. Lamson reported that a Notice of Preparation was prepared On September 21, 2001 and a Scoping Meeting held on October 10, 2002.

Ms. Lamson informed the Commission that on October 4, 2004 and October 18, 2004, both projects were presented to the Historical Commission. Ms. Lamson explained that Mr. Tom Tang of CRM Tech completed the Cultural analysis for the EIR and Mr. Michael Lerch of SRI explained the process of the locating the Zanja. She stated that at that meeting, Mr. Gil Prestwood of Lewis Corp. presented the project and provided background, project goals and objectives, and overall intent of the project to the Historical Commission. Mr. Allan Fishman, of William Hezmalhalch Architects, Inc., presented the land use plan and site map of the University Village project and Mr. Ric Stephens of AEI-CASC presented the plan for the Orchard Park project. Ms. Lamson reported that the discussion regarding the Orchard Park project was continued to a special meeting of the Historical Commission on October 18, 2004. She continued to say that on October 11, 2004, the Parks, Recreation and Beautification Committee reviewed the park plans for both projects and provided comments, and that the Trails Development Committee reviewed both projects on October 14, 2004.

Ms. Lamson explained that pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was completed during the latter part of August 2004 and released for the mandatory 45-day public review period along with the Notice of Completion and Availability, beginning on Wednesday, September 8, 2004, and ending on Friday, October 22, 2004. She added that the comments and responses to the comments received during this period would be provided to the Planning Commission for review and consideration at the December 1, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that Specific Plans were advanced planning tools that provided the land use, density, scale, and architectural design characteristics that guide the future detailed development plans and that implementation of the Specific Plans would be achieved through the approval of Tract and Parcel Maps, Precise Plan of Design and Conditional Use Permit applications for the respective project areas. She added that the residential development would be required to establish a Homeowners Association and to develop and record appropriate Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's).

Mr. Gil Prestwood, 1156 N. Mountain Ave, Upland - Lewis Corp. representative, gave an overview of the University Village project. He stated that the project had evolved over time in tandem with the growth of the City in past three years. He added that Lewis Corp. was also working with staff to ensure that all the changes that have occurred relative to the General Plan Update would be addressed in the planning of the project. Mr. Prestwood stated the project's vision was to preserve and enhance the rural atmosphere of Mission Road and to apply the livable/walkable community concepts to their project.

Mr. Allan Fishman, William Hezmalhalch Architects, Inc. for the project provided the site plans and stated that they were working to achieve a very orderly transition throughout the project from the commercial uses on Redlands Boulevard and the multi-family to the larger lots designs on Mission Road.

Mr. Fishman described some of the proposed types of development they were envisioning for their project site.

- Restaurants on Redlands Boulevard
- Traditional alley-loaded town homes with amenities
- Multi-family cluster configuration
- Multi-family for rent apartments with amenities
- Single-family detached dwellings
- Single-family homes on Mission Road with large lots – 95' x 77'
- Affordable housing for rent in a gated community with amenities

Mr. Fishman further described the proposed parks and open space:

- A Historic Park to preserve resources such as the Frink adobe
- A Heritage Park where historic buildings would be moved such as the Curtis Fisk house, the Cole house, the stone arch and carriage barn, the Helen Hinkley house, the Victoria farmhouse.
- Standard 8' wide trails

He added that signage would be addressed with many monument signs that would integrate with the approved projects on the south side of Mission Road, Mission Trails, Mission Lane, and Mission Creek.

He thanked the Planning Commission for the opportunity to present his project and stated that staff was very helpful in sharing the Planning Commission's vision in the planning of their project.

Ms. Susan Stoltenberg of AEI-CASC, 937 South Via Lata, provided an overview of the Orchard Park project. She stated that their project had evolved over time as well. Ms. Stoltenberg listed some of the changes saying that the acreage for single-family residences had been increased to 33 acres, that six acres had been set aside for parks and open space, and that two floating parks had been removed from the plans. She commented that the Historical Commission had approved the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. She discussed the decomposed granite trail that would follow the Zanja along with lighting and monumentation throughout the project. She thanked the Planning Commission for providing her with the opportunity to present the details of her project.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:55 pm.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road stated that he was concerned about the "rural" concept in the Historic Mission Overlay District Ordinance and its application in these projects stating that he didn't think that either project represented a livable/walkable community. He felt that the planned areas would not promote walkability. He stated that there was no variety of residential uses being offered and that he was concerned about traffic issues and how the mitigation monies for fair share of traffic impacts would be spent. He would like to know what traffic improvements they will be spent for. He also asked for lower densities within both projects.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, stated that she was concerned that the projects did not comply with the Historic Mission Overlay District Ordinance. She presented the SCAG requirements that she researched from 1998-2005. She said that the total units proposed exceed SCAG's annual requirements. She stated that openness was not promoted in these two plans. She was concerned about the proposal of 27 dwelling units to the acre and having large enough homes for seniors to live. She is concerned about lots that are 4,000 square feet being too small. She requested that the very high densities be replaced with lower densities.

Kathy Glendrange, 25541 Beaumont Avenue stated that she was concerned that both projects were not consistent with the Housing Element and SCAG requirements. She quoted the EIR where it states that there were inconsistencies with the projects and SCAG's policies and would like to have this inconsistency addressed. Ms. Glendrange requested that growth only be promoted when it can enhance the quality of life.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 8:11 pm.

Vice Chair Neff commented that the General Plan Update discussion for Planning Area D where the two projects were located had not yet been resolved and suggested that the Commission's comments and decision be provided to the applicants as soon as possible after the determination was made.

Commissioner Umeda commented that this was a large project with many issues involving density, and that more time would be required to study the project. He added that he also had concerns regarding design guidelines. Commissioner Umeda suggested that the Planning Commission provide input before the project came before them and appoint a subcommittee to work with staff and the developers to formulate design guidelines that all of the individual builders could follow. He added that this would reduce the discussion time during the Commission meeting.

Mr. Leon Swales, Chief of Operations for Lewis Corp. informed the Commission that he fully supported the Planning Commission and would like to share the guidelines used in the planning of the project to ensure that they are aiming for the same goal of a high quality product. He added that he would work with the Planning Commission to add garages, four-sided architecture for corner lots, and landscaping and other issues that the Commission wished to discuss.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that the guidelines for each project would be contained in the Specific Plans. She stated that she could prepare a schedule of meetings to review the EIR, the Land Use plans, and the Specific plans using established design guidelines with a subcommittee appointed by Commission.

Director Woldruff asked if the Commissioners had any questions for the Orchard Park project. Commissioner Umeda replied that his comments for University Village were equally applicable to the Orchard Park project.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 4-0 to continue the project to the regular meeting of December 1, 2004 for further discussion. (Christianson absent)

CONTINUED ITEMS

PC-04-53 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

- **DISCUSSION OF PLANNING AREAS G & J**
- **REQUEST FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF PLANNING AREAS D & H**
- **REQUEST FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF PLANNING AREAS A, B, & C**
- **CONTINUE THE HILLSIDE DESIGNATION AND ALTERNATIVES 1 & 2**

Director Woldruff presented a brief staff report then invited Consultant Lloyd Zola of LSA Associates to explain the language changes to Planning Areas G & J. She added that those changes were included in the Commissioner's packet.

Mr. Zola explained that language was added to say that residential uses could be permitted uses in Planning Area G but that the preferred land use would be a mix of commercial and employment-generating office and business. He continued to say that the feasibility of commercial, office and institutional development needed to extend beyond analysis of current market conditions and straight-line projection and should address the potential success of private and public efforts in attracting the desired uses in the long range planning.

Commissioner Sakala stated that it was important for the image of the City Loma Linda to be consistent for all developments throughout the City.

Chair Rosenbaum asked the Commissioners if they wanted to see other changes to the designation of that Planning Area G.

Commissioner Umeda stated that the City had an interest in preserving the area for commercial uses and that developers should be told that it was that type of development that was favored in Planning Area G. He added that it was important to reserve those areas for light industrial and commercial and restated that areas G & J should have a commercial designation.

Vice Chair Neff stated that the Commission had asked staff to add a combination of uses with commercial on the corners i.e. California & Barton and other uses for the balance of the planning area. He stated that Mr. Zola had done what the Planning Commission had requested him to do.

Commissioner Umeda replied that his concerns had not been met even though the requested language changes had been performed.

Vice Chair Neff reiterated that diverse designations for Planning Area G should be established.

Commissioner Sakala restated that long term planning should be considered when placing language in the General Plan.

Chair Rosenbaum asked for guidance from Director Woldruff asking if each Planning Area should be considered separately or as a group. Director Woldruff suggested that discussion of each individual planning area would be less confusing and a decision made for each Planning Area as the discussion concluded.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 9:06 p.m.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road commented that the General Plan should be made more restrictive making it harder for development to occur. On the issue of the reconsideration of Planning Areas A, B & C, where the density is higher, he stated that those areas could be addressed in a different manner and could support a designation of High Density because of the existing development in that area.

John Shumway, Concord Group, commented that the feasibility study that was performed for the Spanos project was based on a commercial designation and that the outcome had not been favorable for commercial development. He added that the analysis was not prepared on the basis of straight-line projections. He added that if Planning Area G did not have some residential uses, then it would be lacking.

Terri Smith, KTK Construction, 18627 Brookhurst Street, #349, Fountain Valley, CA commented that the remaining parcel in Planning Area G was approximately 2 acres and would be too small for any commercial venture. He stated that he was in favor of keeping the designation proposed in the updated General Plan for that area.

John Mirau, Attorney for Cal-88, 1806 Orange Tree Lane, Redlands, commented that a specific plan was very similar to a general plan and that the requirements for the Environmental Impact Report were similar to an economical study. He added that he didn't think that the whole area along California Street would develop completely if a commercial designation was approved. On the issue of density, if it were modified as suggested by the Planning Commission's proposed changes to the General Plan, it would be inconsistent with the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and added that he did not support the changes to the commercial only designation.

Bob Bell, 728 East Katella Avenue, Orange, owner of the property south of Citrus Street stated that if the area were to become commercial, it would make it impossible for him to develop his land. He stated that residential development was what the most popular type of development at this time and that a change to commercial could result in a loss of tax income for the City from those residential projects.

Gil Prestwood, 1156 N. Mountain Ave, Upland - representative for Lewis Corp. commented that a General Plan should not be too general but by the same token not too specific. He added that the Planning Commission should build some flexibility into it.

Paul Hsu, ADR Development Inc., 20151 Sealpoint Lane #109, Huntington Beach, CA stated that he owned approximately 35 acres in Planning Areas J & G, with frontage on New Jersey. He explained that he was planning to annex the land into the City of Loma Linda, as it was currently in the County area where it benefits from a High Density Residential designation. He requested that the Planning Commission keep some parts of Planning Areas J & G Multi-family residential.

Susan Stoltenberg, AEI-CASC, 937 South Via Lata, Ste 500, Colton, CA stated that previous members of the audience and developers had touched on the same concerns, and therefore she would not repeat them. She asked if future projects proposed for Planning Commission G & J would be required to prepare a specific plan.

Kathy Glendrange, Beaumont Avenue, suggested reducing the density in Planning Area H by eliminating medium density, and this would effectively deal with the traffic issues.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 9:31 p.m.

Before the discussion resumed, Director Woldruff reminded the Commission had already approved a project in Planning Area G, Barton Vineyards and that there was only a very small 2-acre parcel left in the area.

Vice Chair Neff wished to evaluate the progress of the discussion and made the following motion.

A Motion by Neff to approve Planning Area G as modified in the Draft General Plan Update was seconded by Rosenbaum, and failed due to a tie vote of 2 to 2, Rosenbaum and Neff in favor, Umeda and Sakala opposed, Christianson absent.

Vice Chair Neff asked Commissioner Umeda to share his reasons for wanting the changes to the designation of Planning Area G, even though there was only one 2-acre vacant property remaining in that area.

Commissioner Umeda replied that it was because if the west side were to be Medium High density with some commercial, the parcel would be cut off from the rest of Planning Area G.

Vice Chair Neff asked staff how they viewed the mixed-use designation as opposed to the proposed change to a commercial designation.

Director Woldruff replied that the mixed-use designation was based on information and input received at the various workshops and that at this point a mixed-use concept would be most advantageous to the City. Director Woldruff stated that staff was asking for some flexibility in the General Plan because residential development was needed in the City. She added that staff would not have proposed the designation if it was not good for the City of Loma Linda.

Commissioner Umeda commented that there was also a need for other types of uses in the City other than residential.

Vice Chair Neff replied that property owners consulted with staff and that staff was following the guidelines of the General Plan before bringing any proposal before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Sakala stated she was uncomfortable going against the wishes of the residents of Loma Linda.

Chair Rosenbaum suggested that the discussion turn to Planning Area J to see if a consensus could be obtained.

Mr. Zola explained that the density had been lowered in Planning Area J from High Density to Medium-High Density. Other language was added stating that it was not the City's intent that this planning area be exclusively Medium to High Density. If developers requested the high density for their project, they would be required to provide a very high level of amenities.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out that the text did state that the intended land use for this area included commercial, office, institutional, business and/or industrial parks.

Vice Chair Neff reiterated that staff had been directed to find language as an appropriate compromise for this section as for the other.

A Motion by Neff to approve Planning Area J as modified in the Draft General Plan Update was seconded by Rosenbaum, and failed due to a tie vote of 2 to 2, Rosenbaum and Neff in favor, Umeda and Sakala opposed, Christianson absent.

Vice Chair Neff asked Commissioner Umeda why he was adamant about a commercial designation for the area.

Commissioner Umeda replied that he had stated his objections earlier and that he would not repeat the justification for the commercial designation provided during the discussion of Planning Area G.

Director Woldruff suggested that the item be continued until the full Planning Commission was present as the discussions were not very productive. She added that Commissioner Christianson had left her a voice mail message stating that he had some concerns that he would like to voice.

Chair Rosenbaum asked if staff could provide the maps the following documents: Existing General Plan and Zoning maps along with the Proposed General Plan map.

Director Woldruff stated that she would provide maps of the General Plan and Zoning plus three or four pages from the existing General Plan. She would also obtain the County Land Use Designation for those areas in the City's sphere but not annexed for areas G, H, & J.

Motion by Neff, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 4-0, to continue the discussion of Planning Areas G & J, D & H of the General Plan Update, Reconsider Planning Areas A, B, and C, which includes a request by the Loma Linda University Foundation, and continue the discussion of the Hillside Designation and Alternatives 1 & 2, to a Special Meeting on November 10, 2004. (Christianson absent)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Because of the late hour, the Director of the Community Development Department did not present a report.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Neff, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 4-0 to adjourn to the Adjourned Regular meeting of November 10, 2004. (Christianson absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 pm

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of November 10, 2004

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Oct20M-app.doc